

On a possible quantum contribution to the red shift*

K. Urbanowski[†]

University of Zielona Góra, Institute of Physics,
ul. Prof. Z. Szafrana 4a, 65–516 Zielona Góra, Poland.

June 19, 2008

Abstract

We consider an effect generated by the nonexponential behavior of the survival amplitude of an unstable state in the long time region: In 1957 Khalfin proved that this amplitude tends to zero as t goes to the infinity more slowly than any exponential function of t . This effect can be described in terms of time-dependent decay rate $\gamma(t)$ and then the Khalfin result means that this $\gamma(t)$ is not a constant for long times but that it tends to zero as t goes to the infinity. It appears that a similar conclusion can be drawn for the energy of the unstable state for a large class of models of unstable particles: This energy should be much smaller for suitably long times t than the energy of this state for t of the order of the lifetime of the considered state. Within a given model we show that the energy corrections in the long ($t \rightarrow \infty$) and relatively short (lifetime of the state) time regions, are different. It is shown that these corrections decrease to $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_{min} < \mathcal{E}_\phi$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, where $\mathcal{E}_\phi$ is the energy of the system in the state $|\phi\rangle$ measured at times $t \sim \tau_\phi = \frac{\hbar}{\gamma}$. This is a purely quantum mechanical effect. It is hypothesized that there is a possibility to detect this effect by analyzing the spectra of distant astrophysical objects. The above property of unstable states may influence the measured values of astrophysical and cosmological parameters.

*Talk prepared for the Conference *Problems of Practical Cosmology*, Saint Petersburg, Russia, June 23 – 27, 2008

[†]e-mail: K.Urbanowski@proton.if.uz.zgora.pl; K.Urbanowski@if.uz.zgora.pl

1 Introduction

Within the quantum theory the state vector at time t , $|\Phi(t)\rangle$, for the physical system under consideration which initially (at $t = t_0 = 0$) was in the state $|\Phi\rangle$ can be found by solving the Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} |\Phi(t)\rangle = H |\Phi(t)\rangle, \quad |\Phi(0)\rangle = |\Phi\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where $|\Phi(t)\rangle, |\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{H}$ is the Hilbert space of states of the considered system, $\| |\Phi(t)\rangle \| = \| |\Phi\rangle \| = 1$ and H denotes the total selfadjoint Hamiltonian for the system. If one considers an unstable state $|\Phi\rangle \equiv |\phi\rangle$ of the system then using the solution $|\phi(t)\rangle$ of Eq. (1) for the initial condition $|\phi(0)\rangle = |\phi\rangle$ one can determine the decay law, $\mathcal{P}_\phi(t)$ of this state decaying in vacuum

$$\mathcal{P}_\phi(t) = |a(t)|^2, \quad (2)$$

where $a(t)$ is probability amplitude of finding the system at the time t in the initial state $|\phi\rangle$ prepared at time $t_0 = 0$,

$$a(t) = \langle \phi | \phi(t) \rangle. \quad (3)$$

We have

$$a(0) = 1. \quad (4)$$

From basic principles of quantum theory it is known that the amplitude $a(t)$, and thus the decay law $\mathcal{P}_\phi(t)$ of the unstable state $|\phi\rangle$, are completely determined by the density of the energy distribution $\omega(\mathcal{E})$ for the system in this state [1],

$$a(t) = \int_{Spec.(H)} \omega(\mathcal{E}) e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} \mathcal{E} t} d\mathcal{E}. \quad (5)$$

where $\omega(\mathcal{E}) > 0$.

Note that (5) and (4) mean that there must be

$$a(0) = \int_{Spec.(H)} \omega(\mathcal{E}) d\mathcal{E} = 1. \quad (6)$$

From the last property and from the Riemann–Lebesgue Lemma it follows that the amplitude $a(t)$, being the Fourier transform of $\omega(\mathcal{E})$ (see (5)), must tend to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$ [1].

In [2] assuming that the spectrum of H must be bounded from below, ($\text{Spec.}(H) > -\infty$), and using the Paley–Wiener Theorem [3] it was proved that in the case of unstable states there must be

$$|a(t)| \geq A e^{-b t^q}, \quad (7)$$

for $|t| \rightarrow \infty$. Here $A > 0$, $b > 0$ and $0 < q < 1$. This means that the decay law $\mathcal{P}_\phi(t)$ of unstable states decaying in the vacuum, (2), can not be described by an exponential function of time t if time t is suitably long, $t \rightarrow \infty$, and that for these lengths of time $\mathcal{P}_\phi(t)$ tends to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$ more slowly than any exponential function of t . The analysis of the models of the decay processes shows that $\mathcal{P}_\phi(t) \simeq e^{-\frac{\gamma_\phi^0 t}{\hbar}}$, (where γ_ϕ^0 is the decay rate of the state $|\phi\rangle$), to an very high accuracy for a wide time range t : From t suitably later than some $T_0 \simeq t_0 = 0$ but $T_0 > t_0$ up to $t \gg \tau_\phi = \frac{\gamma_\phi^0}{\hbar}$ and smaller than $t = t_{as}$, where t_{as} denotes the time t for which the nonexponential deviations of $a(t)$ begin to dominate (see eg., [2], [4] – [8]). From this analysis it follows that in the general case the decay law $\mathcal{P}_\phi(t)$ takes the inverse power–like form $t^{-\lambda}$, (where $\lambda > 0$), for suitably large $t \geq t_{as} \gg \tau_\phi$ [2], [4] – [7]. This effect is in agreement with the general result (7). Effects of this type are sometimes called the "Khalfin effect" (see eg. [9]).

The problem how to detect possible deviations from the exponential form of $\mathcal{P}_\phi(t)$ at the long time region has been attracting the attention of physicists since the first theoretical predictions of such an effect [10, 11, 8]. Many tests of the decay law performed some time ago did not indicate any deviations from the exponential form of $\mathcal{P}_\phi(t)$ at the long time region. Nevertheless conditions leading to the nonexponential behavior of the amplitude $a(t)$ at long times were studied theoretically [12] – [16]. Conclusions following from these studies were applied successfully in experiment described in [17], where the experimental evidence of deviations from the exponential decay law at long times was reported. This result gives rise to another problem which now becomes important: if (and how) deviations from the exponential decay law at long times affect the energy of the unstable state and its decay rate at this time region.

Note that in fact the amplitude $a(t)$ contains information about the decay law $\mathcal{P}_\phi(t)$ of the state $|\phi\rangle$, that is about the decay rate γ_ϕ^0 of this state, as well as the energy $\mathcal{E}_\phi^0$ of the system in this state. This information can be extracted from $a(t)$. Indeed if $|\phi\rangle$ is an unstable (a quasi–stationary) state

then

$$a(t) \cong e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}(\mathcal{E}_\phi^0 - \frac{i}{2}\gamma_\phi^0)t}. \quad (8)$$

So, there is

$$\mathcal{E}_\phi^0 - \frac{i}{2}\gamma_\phi^0 \equiv i\hbar \frac{\partial a(t)}{\partial t} \frac{1}{a(t)}, \quad (9)$$

in the case of quasi-stationary states.

The standard interpretation and understanding of the quantum theory and the related construction of our measuring devices are such that detecting the energy $\mathcal{E}_\phi^0$ and decay rate γ_ϕ^0 one is sure that the amplitude $a(t)$ has the form (8) and thus that the relation (9) occurs. Taking the above into account one can define the "effective Hamiltonian", h_ϕ , for the one-dimensional subspace of states $\mathcal{H}_\parallel$ spanned by the normalized vector $|\phi\rangle$ as follows (see, eg. [18])

$$h_\phi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} i\hbar \frac{\partial a(t)}{\partial t} \frac{1}{a(t)}. \quad (10)$$

In general, h_ϕ can depend on time t , $h_\phi \equiv h_\phi(t)$. One meets this effective Hamiltonian when one starts with the Schrödinger Equation (1) for the total state space $\mathcal{H}$ and looks for the rigorous evolution equation for the distinguished subspace of states $\mathcal{H}_\parallel \subset \mathcal{H}$. In the case of one-dimensional $\mathcal{H}_\parallel$ this rigorous Schrödinger-like evolution equation has the following form for the initial condition $a(0) = 1$ (see [18] and references one finds therein),

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial a(t)}{\partial t} = h_\phi(t) a(t). \quad (11)$$

Relations (10) and (11) establish a direct connection between the amplitude $a(t)$ for the state $|\phi\rangle$ and the exact effective Hamiltonian $h_\phi(t)$ governing the time evolution in the one-dimensional subspace $\mathcal{H}_\parallel \ni |\phi\rangle$. Thus the use of the evolution equation (11) or the relation (10) is one of the most effective tools for the accurate analysis of the early- as well as the long-time properties of the energy and decay rate of a given quasistationary state $|\phi(t)\rangle$.

So let us assume that we know the amplitude $a(t)$. Then starting with this $a(t)$ and using the expression (10) one can calculate the effective Hamiltonian $h_\phi(t)$ in a general case for every t . Thus, one finds the following expressions for the energy and the decay rate of the system in the state $|\phi\rangle$ under considerations,

$$\mathcal{E}_\phi \equiv \mathcal{E}_\phi(t) = \Re(h_\phi(t)), \quad (12)$$

$$\gamma_\phi \equiv \gamma_\phi(t) = -2 \Im(h_\phi(t)), \quad (13)$$

where $\Re(z)$ and $\Im(z)$ denote the real and imaginary parts of z respectively.

As it was mentioned above the deviations of the decay law $\mathcal{P}_\phi(t)$ from the exponential form can be described equivalently using time-dependent decay rate. In terms of such $\gamma_\phi(t)$ the Khalfin observation that $\mathcal{P}_\phi(t)$ must tend to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$ more slowly than any exponential function means that $\gamma_\phi(t) \ll \gamma_\phi^0$ for $t \gg t_{as}$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_\phi(t) = 0$.

Using (10) and (12), (13) one can find that

$$\mathcal{E}_\phi(0) = \langle \phi | H | \phi \rangle, \quad (14)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_\phi(t \sim \tau_\phi) \simeq \mathcal{E}_\phi^0 \neq \mathcal{E}_\phi(0), \quad (15)$$

$$\gamma_\phi(0) = 0, \quad (16)$$

$$\gamma_\phi(t \sim \tau_\phi) \simeq \gamma_\phi^0. \quad (17)$$

The aim of this talk is to discuss the long time behaviour of $\mathcal{E}_\phi(t)$ using $a(t)$ calculated for the given density $\omega(\mathcal{E})$. We show that $\mathcal{E}_\phi(t) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_{min}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for the model considered and that a wide class of models has similar long time properties: $\mathcal{E}_\phi(t)|_{t \rightarrow \infty} \neq \mathcal{E}_\phi^0$. It seems that in contrast to the standard Khalfin effect [2] in the case of the quasistationary states belonging to the same class as excited atomic levels, this long time properties of the energy $\mathcal{E}_\phi(t)$ have a chance to be detected, eg., by analyzing spectra of very distant stars.

2 The model

Let us assume that $Spec.(H) = [\mathcal{E}_{min}, \infty)$, (where, $\mathcal{E}_{min} > -\infty$), and let us choose $\omega(\mathcal{E})$ as follows

$$\omega(\mathcal{E}) = \frac{N}{2\pi} \Theta(\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{E}_{min}) \frac{\gamma_\phi^0}{(\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{E}_\phi^0)^2 + (\frac{\gamma_\phi^0}{2})^2}, \quad (18)$$

where N is a normalization constant and

$$\Theta(\mathcal{E}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } \mathcal{E} \geq 0, \\ 0 & \text{for } \mathcal{E} < 0, \end{cases}$$

For such $\omega(\mathcal{E})$ using (5) one has

$$a(t) = \frac{N}{2\pi} \int_{\mathcal{E}_{min}}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma_\phi^0}{(\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{E}_\phi^0)^2 + (\frac{\gamma_\phi^0}{2})^2} e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} \mathcal{E} t} d\mathcal{E}, \quad (19)$$

where

$$\frac{1}{N} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathcal{E}_{min}}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma_{\phi}^0}{(\mathcal{E} - \mathcal{E}_{\phi}^0)^2 + (\frac{\gamma_{\phi}^0}{2})^2} d\mathcal{E}. \quad (20)$$

Formula (19) leads to the result

$$\begin{aligned} a(t) = & N e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}(\mathcal{E}_{\phi}^0 - i\frac{\gamma_{\phi}^0}{2})t} \times \\ & \times \left\{ 1 - \frac{i}{2\pi} \left[e^{\frac{\gamma_{\phi}^0 t}{\hbar}} E_1\left(-\frac{i}{\hbar}(\mathcal{E}_{\phi}^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min} + \frac{i}{2}\gamma_{\phi}^0)t\right) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + (-1)E_1\left(-\frac{i}{\hbar}(\mathcal{E}_{\phi}^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min} - \frac{i}{2}\gamma_{\phi}^0)t\right) \right] \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $E_1(x)$ denotes the integral-exponential function [19, 20].

Using (19) or (21) one easily finds that

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial a(t)}{\partial t} = (\mathcal{E}_{\phi}^0 - \frac{i}{2}\gamma_{\phi}^0) a(t) + \Delta a(t), \quad (22)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta a(t) = & \frac{N}{\pi} \frac{\gamma_{\phi}^0}{2} e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}(\mathcal{E}_{\phi}^0 + \frac{i}{2}\gamma_{\phi}^0)t} \times \\ & \times E_1\left(-\frac{i}{\hbar}(\mathcal{E}_{\phi}^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min} + \frac{i}{2}\gamma_{\phi}^0)t\right). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

So,

$$h_{\phi}(t) \equiv i\hbar \frac{\partial a(t)}{\partial t} \frac{1}{a(t)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h_{\phi}^0 + \Delta h_{\phi}(t), \quad (24)$$

where

$$h_{\phi}^0 \equiv \mathcal{E}_{\phi}^0 - \frac{i}{2}\gamma_{\phi}^0, \quad (25)$$

and

$$\Delta h_{\phi}(t) = + \frac{\Delta a(t)}{a(t)}. \quad (26)$$

Making use of the asymptotic expansion of $E_1(x)$ [20],

$$E_1(z)|_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} \sim \frac{e^{-z}}{z} \left(1 - \frac{1}{z} + \frac{2}{z^2} - \dots\right), \quad (27)$$

where $|\arg z| < \frac{3}{2}\pi$, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} a(t)|_{t \rightarrow \infty} &\simeq N e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} h_\phi^0 t} \\ &+ \frac{N}{2\pi} e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} \mathcal{E}_{min} t} \left\{ (-i) \frac{\gamma_\phi^0}{|h_\phi^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}|^2} \frac{\hbar}{t} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (-2) \frac{(\mathcal{E}_\phi^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}) \gamma_\phi^0}{|h_\phi^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}|^4} \left(\frac{\hbar}{t}\right)^2 + \dots \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta a(t)|_{t \rightarrow \infty} &\simeq \frac{N \gamma_\phi^0}{2\pi} e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} \mathcal{E}_{min} t} \left\{ \frac{h_\phi^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}}{|h_\phi^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}|^2} \frac{\hbar}{t} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{(h_\phi^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min})^2}{|h_\phi^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}|^4} \left(\frac{\hbar}{t}\right)^2 + \dots \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

These two last asymptotic expansions enable one to find (see (26))

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta h_\phi(t)|_{t \rightarrow \infty} &= \frac{\Delta a(t)}{a(t)} \Big|_{t \rightarrow \infty} \\ &\simeq -(h_\phi^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}) - i \frac{\hbar}{t} - 2 \frac{\mathcal{E}_\phi^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}}{|h_\phi^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}|^2} \left(\frac{\hbar}{t}\right)^2 + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Thus, there is

$$h_\phi(t)|_{t \rightarrow \infty} \simeq \mathcal{E}_{min} - i \frac{\hbar}{t} - 2 \frac{\mathcal{E}_\phi^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}}{|h_\phi^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}|^2} \left(\frac{\hbar}{t}\right)^2 + \dots \quad (31)$$

for the considered case (18) of $\omega(\mathcal{E})$.

From (31) it follows that

$$\Re(h_\phi(t)|_{t \rightarrow \infty}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{E}_\phi^\infty \simeq \mathcal{E}_{min} - 2 \frac{\mathcal{E}_\phi^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}}{|h_\phi^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}|^2} \left(\frac{\hbar}{t}\right)^2 \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathcal{E}_{min}, \quad (32)$$

where $\mathcal{E}_\phi^\infty = \mathcal{E}_\phi(t)|_{t \rightarrow \infty}$, and

$$\Im(h_\phi(t)|_{t \rightarrow \infty}) \simeq -\frac{\hbar}{t} \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{} 0. \quad (33)$$

The property (32) means that

$$\Re(h_\phi(t)|_{t \rightarrow \infty}) \equiv \mathcal{E}_\phi^\infty < \mathcal{E}_\phi^0. \quad (34)$$

For different states $|\phi\rangle = |j\rangle$, ($j = 1, 2, 3, \dots$) one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_1^\infty - \mathcal{E}_2^\infty &= -2 \left[\frac{\mathcal{E}_1^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}}{|h_1^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}|^2} - \frac{\mathcal{E}_2^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}}{|h_2^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}|^2} \right] \left(\frac{\hbar}{t} \right)^2 \\ &\neq \mathcal{E}_1^0 - \mathcal{E}_2^0 \neq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Note that

$$\Im(h_1(t)|_{t \rightarrow \infty}) = \Im(h_2(t)|_{t \rightarrow \infty}), \quad (36)$$

whereas in general $\gamma_1^0 \neq \gamma_2^0$.

The most interesting relations seems to be the following one

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathcal{E}_1^\infty - \mathcal{E}_2^\infty}{\mathcal{E}_3^\infty - \mathcal{E}_{\phi_4}^\infty} &= \frac{\frac{\mathcal{E}_1^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}}{|h_1^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}|^2} - \frac{\mathcal{E}_2^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}}{|h_2^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}|^2}}{\frac{\mathcal{E}_3^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}}{|h_3^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}|^2} - \frac{\mathcal{E}_4^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}}{|h_4^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}|^2}} \\ &\neq \frac{\mathcal{E}_1^0 - \mathcal{E}_2^0}{\mathcal{E}_3^0 - \mathcal{E}_4^0}, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

and

$$\frac{\Im(h_1(t)|_{t \rightarrow \infty})}{\Im(h_2(t)|_{t \rightarrow \infty})} = 1 \neq \frac{\gamma_1^0}{\gamma_2^0}. \quad (38)$$

The relation (37) is valid also when one takes $|1\rangle$ instead of $|3\rangle$ or $|2\rangle$ instead of $|4\rangle$. It seems to be interesting that relations (37), (38) do not depend on time t .

Note that the following conclusion can be drawn from (35): For suitably long times $t > t_{as}$ there must be

$$|\mathcal{E}_1^\infty - \mathcal{E}_2^\infty| < |\mathcal{E}_1^0 - \mathcal{E}_2^0|. \quad (39)$$

These suitable times can be estimated using relation (28). From (28) one obtains

$$|a(t)|_{t \rightarrow \infty}|^2 \simeq N^2 e^{-\frac{\gamma_\phi^0}{\hbar} t} + \frac{N^2}{4\pi^2} \frac{(\gamma_\phi^0)^2}{|h_\phi^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}|^4} \frac{\hbar^2}{t^2} + \dots \quad (40)$$

Relations (30) — (39) become important for times $t > t_{as}$, where t_{as} denotes the time t at which contributions to $|a(t)|_{t \rightarrow \infty}|^2$ from the first exponential

component in (40) and from the second component proportional to $\frac{1}{t^2}$ are comparable. So t_{as} can be found by considering the following relation

$$e^{-\frac{\gamma_\phi^0}{\hbar} t} \sim \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \frac{(\gamma_\phi^0)^2}{|h_\phi^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}|^4} \frac{\hbar^2}{t^2}. \quad (41)$$

Assuming that the right hand side is equal to the left hand side in the above relation one gets a transcendental equation. Exact solutions of such an equation can be expressed by means of the Lambert W function [21]. An asymptotic solution of the equation obtained from the relation (41) is relatively easy to find [22]. The very approximate asymptotic solution, t_{as} , of this equation for $(\frac{\mathcal{E}_\phi^0}{\gamma_\phi^0}) > 10^2$ (in general for $(\frac{\mathcal{E}_\phi^0}{\gamma_\phi^0}) \rightarrow \infty$) has the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\gamma_\phi^0 t_{as}}{\hbar} \simeq & 8,28 + 4 \ln\left(\frac{\mathcal{E}_\phi^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}}{\gamma_\phi^0}\right) \\ & + 2 \ln[8,28 + 4 \ln\left(\frac{\mathcal{E}_\phi^0 - \mathcal{E}_{min}}{\gamma_\phi^0}\right)] + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

3 Some generalizations

To complete the analysis performed in the previous Section let us consider a more general case of $a(t)$. Namely, let the asymptotic approximation to $a(t)$ have the form

$$a(t) \underset{t \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} e^{-i\frac{t}{\hbar} \mathcal{E}_{min}} \sum_{k=0}^N \frac{c_k}{t^{\lambda+k}}, \quad (43)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ and c_k are complex numbers. The simplest case occurs for $\mathcal{E}_{min} = 0$. Note that the asymptotic expansion for $a(t)$ of this or a similar form one obtains for a wide class of densities of energy distribution $\omega(\mathcal{E})$ [2, 4, 6, 7, 9], [12] – [16], [23].

From the relation (43) one concludes that

$$\frac{\partial a(t)}{\partial t} \underset{t \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} e^{-i\frac{t}{\hbar} \mathcal{E}_{min}} \left\{ -\frac{i}{\hbar} \mathcal{E}_{min} - \sum_{k=0}^N (\lambda + k) \frac{c_k}{t^{\lambda+k+1}} \right\}. \quad (44)$$

Now let us take into account the relation (11). From this relation and relations (43), (44) it follows that

$$h_\phi(t) \underset{t \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \mathcal{E}_{min} + \frac{d_1}{t} + \frac{d_2}{t^2} + \frac{d_3}{t^3} + \dots, \quad (45)$$

where $d_1, d_2, d_3, \dots$ are complex numbers with negative or positive real and imaginary parts. This means that in the case of the asymptotic approximation to $a(t)$ of the form (43) the following property holds,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} h_\phi(t) = \mathcal{E}_{min} < \mathcal{E}_\phi^0. \quad (46)$$

It seems to be important that results (45) and (46) coincide with the results (31) — (35) obtained for the density $\omega(\mathcal{E})$ given by the formula (18). This means that general conclusion obtained for the other $\omega(\mathcal{E})$ defining unstable states should be similar to those following from (31) — (35).

4 Final remarks.

Let us consider a class of unstable states formed by excited atomic energy levels and let these excited atoms emit the electromagnetic waves of the energies $\mathcal{E}_\phi^0 = \mathcal{E}_{n_{jk}}^0 \equiv h \nu_{n_{jk}}^0$ (where $\nu_{n_{jk}}^0$ denotes the frequency of the emitted wave, and $\mathcal{E}_{n_{jk}}^0$ is energy emitted by an electron jumping from the energy level n_j to the energy level n_k). Then for times $t > t_{as}$, according to the results of the previous sections, there should be

$$\mathcal{E}_{n_{jk}}^\infty < \mathcal{E}_{n_{jk}}^0. \quad (47)$$

So in the case of electromagnetic radiation in the optical range registered by a suitably distant observer this effect should manifest itself as a red shift. In a general case this effect should cause a loss of the energy of the emitted electromagnetic radiation if the distance between an emitter and receiver is suitably long, that is if the emitted radiation reaches such a distance from the emitter that the time necessary for photons to reach this distance is longer than a maximal range of time of the validity of the exponential decay law for the excited atomic level emitting this radiation.

It can be easily verified that relation (37) do not depend on the redshift connected with the Doppler effect [24]. Indeed let the excited atoms emit

the electromagnetic waves and let them move away from the observer with the velocity v . Then, the observer's measuring devices will show that the energies emitted by these moving atoms are $\mathcal{E}_{n_{jk}}^{0,v}$. The energy $\mathcal{E}_{n_{jk}}^0$ emitted by this same source at rest is connected with $\mathcal{E}_{n_{jk}}^{0,v}$ by the Doppler formula [24]

$$\mathcal{E}_{n_{jk}}^{0,v} = \kappa \mathcal{E}_{n_{jk}}^0 < \mathcal{E}_{n_{jk}}^0, \quad (48)$$

where $\kappa = \frac{1-\beta}{\sqrt{1-\beta^2}}$ and $\beta = \frac{v}{c}$, and

$$\mathcal{E}_{n_{1k}}^{0,v} - \mathcal{E}_{n_{2k}}^{0,v} = \kappa (\mathcal{E}_{n_{1k}}^0 - \mathcal{E}_{n_{2k}}^0). \quad (49)$$

From (48) and (49) it follows that

$$\frac{\mathcal{E}_{n_{1k}}^{0,v} - \mathcal{E}_{n_{2k}}^{0,v}}{\mathcal{E}_{n_{3k}}^{0,v} - \mathcal{E}_{n_{4k}}^{0,v}} = \frac{\mathcal{E}_{n_{1k}}^0 - \mathcal{E}_{n_{2k}}^0}{\mathcal{E}_{n_{3k}}^0 - \mathcal{E}_{n_{4k}}^0}. \quad (50)$$

Now, let us assume for a moment that the $\omega(\mathcal{E})$ given by the formula (18) describes the considered sources with the sufficient accuracy. Next if one additionally assumes that in the distant past photons of energies, say $\mathcal{E}_{n_{jk}}^0$, ($j = 1, 2$), were emitted and that the sources of this emission were moving away from the observer with known constant velocity v , then at the present epoch this observer detects energies $\mathcal{E}_{n_{jk}}^{\infty'} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \kappa \mathcal{E}_{n_{jk}}^{\infty}$, where $\mathcal{E}_{n_{jk}}^{\infty} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Re(h_{n_{jk}}(t))|_{t \rightarrow \infty}$. If the moment of this emission was at suitably distant past then according to the results of Sec. 2 (see (39)) it should appear that

$$|\mathcal{E}_{n_{1k}}^{\infty'} - \mathcal{E}_{n_{2k}}^{\infty'}| < |\mathcal{E}_{n_{1k}}^{0,v} - \mathcal{E}_{n_{2k}}^{0,v}| = \kappa |\mathcal{E}_{n_{1k}}^0 - \mathcal{E}_{n_{2k}}^0|, \quad (51)$$

and

$$\frac{\mathcal{E}_{n_{1k}}^{\infty} - \mathcal{E}_{n_{2k}}^{\infty}}{\mathcal{E}_{n_{3k}}^{\infty} - \mathcal{E}_{n_{4k}}^{\infty}} \neq \frac{\mathcal{E}_{n_{1k}}^0 - \mathcal{E}_{n_{2k}}^0}{\mathcal{E}_{n_{3k}}^0 - \mathcal{E}_{n_{4k}}^0}. \quad (52)$$

Therefore it seems that there is a chance to detect the possible effect described in this paper using relation (37) and analyzing spectra of distant astrophysical objects. It can be done using this relation if one is able to register and analyze at least three different emission lines from the same distant source. Another possibility to observe this effect is to modify the experiment described in [17] in such a way that the emitted energy (frequency) of the luminescence decays could be measured which could make possible to test relations (47) or (39).

Unfortunately, the model considered in Sec. 2 does not reflect correctly all properties of the real physical system containing unstable states. Therefore,

formula (37) obtained within this model can not be considered as universally valid and it does not lead to the expressions correctly describing real properties of very distant astronomical sources of electromagnetic radiation. The defect of this model is that some quantities calculated within it are divergent. Indeed from (3), (5) and (1) one finds that

$$i\hbar \left. \frac{\partial a(t)}{\partial t} \right|_{t=0} = \langle \phi | H | \phi \rangle, \quad (53)$$

but inserting into (5) the density $\omega(\mathcal{E})$ given by (18), relation (53) yields $\langle \phi | H | \phi \rangle = \infty$. For this same reason $h_\phi(t)$ and $\Delta h_\phi(t)$ computed for $\omega(\mathcal{E})$ given by (18) are divergent at $t = 0$: $h_\phi(=0) = \infty$, $\Delta h_\phi(t=0) = \infty$. Nevertheless, taking into account that a very wide class of models of unstable states leads to a similar asymptotic long time behaviour of $a(t)$ to this obtained for the model considered in Sec. 2, some general conclusions following from the results of Sec. 2 and 3 seem to deserve more attention.

References

- [1] S. Krylov, V. A. Fock, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **17**, (1947), 93.
- [2] L. A. Khal'fin, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **33**, (1957), 1371 [Sov. Phys. — JETP **6**, (1958), 1053].
- [3] R. E. A. C. Paley, N. Wiener, *Fourier transforms in the complex domain*, American Mathematical Society, New York, 1934.
- [4] M. L. Goldberger, K. M. Watson, *Collision Theory*, Willey, New York 1964.
- [5] R. G. Newton, *Scattering Theory of Waves and Particles*, Springer, New York 1982.
- [6] L. Fonda, G. C. Ghirardii and A. Rimini, Rep. on Prog. in Phys. **41**, (1978), 587.
- [7] A. Peres, Ann. Phys. **129**, (1980), 33.
- [8] P. T. Greenland, Nature **335**, (1988), 298.

- [9] D. G. Arbo, M. A. Castagnino, F. H. Gaioli and S. Iguri, *Physica A* **227**, (2000), 469.
- [10] J. M. Wessner, D. K. Andreson and R. T. Robiscoe, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **29**, (1972), 1126.
- [11] E. B. Norman, S. B. Gazes, S. C. Crane and D. A. Bennet, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, (1988), 2246. E. B. Norman, B. Sur, K. T. Lesko, R.-M. Larimer, *Phys. Lett. B* **357**, (1995), 521.
- [12] J. Seke, W. N. Herfort, *Phys. Rev. A* **38**, (1998), 833.
- [13] R. E. Parrot, J. Lawrence, *Europhys. Lett.* **57**, (2002), 632.
- [14] J. Lawrence, *Journ. Opt. B: Quant. Semiclass. Opt.* **4**, (2002), S446.
- [15] I. Joichi, Sh. Matsumoto, M. Yoshimura, *Phys. Rev. D* **58**, (1998), 045004.
- [16] T. Jiitoh, S. Matsumoto, J. Sato, Y. Sato, K. Takeda, *Phys Rev. A* **71**, (2005), 012109.
- [17] C. Rothe, S. I. Hintschich and A. P. Monkman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, (2006), 163601.
- [18] K. Urbanowski, *Phys. Rev. A* **50**, (1994), 2847.
- [19] K. M. Sluis, E. A. Gislason, *Phys. Rev. A* **43**, (1991), 4581.
- [20] *Handbook of Mathematical Functions*, Natl. Bur. Stand. Appl. Math. Ser. No 55, eds. M. Abramowitz nad I. A. Stegun (U.S. GPO, Washington, D.C., 1964).
- [21] R. M. Corless, G. H. Gonet, D. E. G. Hare, D. J. Jeffrey and D. E. Khnut, *Adv. Comput. Math.* **5**, (1996), 329.
- [22] F. W. J. Olver, *Asymptotics and special functions*, Academic Press, New York, 1974.
- [23] F. M. Dittes, H. L. Harney and A. Müller, *Phys. Rev. A* **45**, (1992), 701.
- [24] W. Heitler, *The Quantum Theory of Radiation*, Oxford University Press, London 1954 and Dover Publications, New York 1984.